steps have been taken not only to recover the losses wherever possible but also to prevent such occurrences in future by introducing changes in the system of accounts or by taking disciplinary action as the case may be.

Reference is invited to the several orders of Government passed on the reports of the Revenue Audit Officer, a list of which is attached for information. (*Vide* Appendix VIII.) Copies of these orders (except those of a confidential nature) will be furnished, if required.

Supplementary Questions.

Mr. D. S. Mallappa.—

With reference to reply (*a*) (3), is there any reduction of expenditure on establishments as a result of the simplified system of office procedure? If so, what is the amount of savings expected?

Second Member of Council.—

Proposals are before the Revenue Commissioner and whether there will be any savings or not cannot be definitely stated until his report on the proposals is received.

Mr. Mallappa.—

Will it be possible to show any reduction in the next year's budget?

Second Member of Council.—

No definite reply can be given until the report from the Revenue Commissioner is received.

By Mr. J. Rudrappa (Tumkur Taluk).—

Q.—35. Will the Government be pleased to furnish information regarding the management of Yediyur temple in Kunigal Taluk on the following particulars:—

(*a*) Have the Government perused the article on the Yediyur temple appearing in the *Mysore Star* of the 13th March 1926? Have the Government made any enquiries to find out the truth or otherwise of the statements contained therein? If so, what is the result?

(*b*) When did the management of the Yediyur temple pass into the hands of the Muzrai Department? Prior to the transfer of management and even after it,

was not one Siddalingiah acting as Gumastha on a small pay and entrusted with the custody of some of the ornaments of the deity?

(*c*) Is the appointment of Parupathegar a hereditary one? Is it not a fact that the appointment of Parupathegar was created in the year 1919 or 1920? If not, in what year was it created? When was the present incumbent appointed as Parupathegar? Are there not instances of one Ranga Naika and Siddalingiah who acted as Gumasthas to keep temple accounts and managed the affairs of the institution when there was no office of Parupathegar attached to the temple and neither the present Parupathegar nor any of his ancestors were in the temple management? Has the present Parupathegar come in as direct descendant of any of his ancestors, if any, in the employment of the temple in an unbroken line of descent?

(*d*) Are the Government aware that the Bhaktas have been very much dissatisfied at the conduct and the behaviour of the present Parupathegar as is evidenced by the resolutions of the Kunigal Veerasaiva Conference at Yediyur, articles appearing in the newspapers and private representations made by means of petitions to the authorities? If so, what steps have the Government taken for the removal of the present man? How long has this simple question been pending under consideration of the Muzrai Commissioner?

(*e*) Are the ornaments now kept in the Taluk Treasury made use of for decorating the deity for the last two years? If not, why not? Who are responsible for it? If they are made use of, to whose hands were they entrusted by the Amildar and who returned them after use?

(*f*) Has the inspection book of the temple come to the notice of the Amildar and when was the closing down of the door behind the temple premises ordered by the Deputy Commissioner of the district and how far has that order been carried into effect by the Amildar? If it has not been carried into effect, what is the cause for the delay?

(*g*) Are there any instances of Brahmins performing "*Sevas*" in the temple? Does the book kept for entry of "*Sevas*" show any such instances? If so, how many instances are there on an average each year for the last three years? Is there any Government Order for the performing of a "*Santharpane*" for Brahmins?

(*h*) What is the basis on which a Dharmadarsi is appointed? Are there Vaishnavites as devotees of the

temple? If so, how many? If not, why is a Vaishnavite Dharmadarsi appointed to a purely Saivite temple?

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, REVENUE DEPARTMENT.—

A.—35. (*a*) Government have since perused the article referred to, and a report from the Deputy Commissioner has been called for.

(*b*) (i) In the year 1904.
(ii) The records do not show that Siddalingiah was acting as a Gumastha.

(*c*) (i) No.
(ii) Yes.
(iii) In 1919.
(iv) No such instances can be traced from the records of the temple.
(v) *Vide* answer to (*c*) (i).

(*d*) The answer to the first part of the question is in the negative. The resolution of the Kunigal Veerasaiva Conference that the present Parupathegar should be changed was enquired into and not accepted by Government.

(*e*) No. These ornaments are required for use only on the occasion of special *Sevas* by Bhaktas; and no such *Sevas* were performed during the period.

(*f*) Yes. There is no record of such an order having been passed by the Deputy Commissioner.

(*g*) (i) Yes, two or three.
(ii) The *Seva* book was only opened recently and instances are not noted therein.
(iii) No.

(*h*) (i) Please see Page 14 of the second Supplement to the Muzrai Manual of 1920.
(ii) No information is available on this point.
(iii) The Dharmadarsi referred to is an influential person, resident at the place whose help is useful in managing the institution.

Supplementary Questions.

Mr. D. S. Mallappa.—

Have the Government perused the proceedings of the Veerasaiva Conference held at Nagamangala, and if so, what action have they taken on the resolution regarding the Brahmin Parupathegar?

Revenue Secretary.—

Government have perused the resolution of the Conference. Government were unable to accept it.

Mr. Mallappa.—

With reference to answer (*b*) (i) was there a Brahmin Parupathegar before 1904 and are there any Non-Brahmin Parupathegars in Brahmin temples?

Revenue Secretary.—

That question requires notice.

Mr. Mallappa.—

Is it not possible to replace the Brahmin Parupathegar by a Saivite?

Revenue Secretary.—

The Parupathegar has been doing good work and has maintained the temple in a good condition. The income of the temple has also increased.

Mr. Mallappa.—

Are there any Saivite pujaris in Vaishnavite temples?

Revenue Secretary.—

This requires notice.

Mr. Mallappa.—

When the Bhaktas want him to be removed, cannot the Government remove him?

Dewan-President.—

We shall consider.

By Mr. Puttaveerabhadrappa (Maddagiri Taluk).—

Q—36. Will the Government be pleased to state if, as promised at the Representative Assembly (Dasara Session) of 1924 (Subject No. 21), restriction for removal of stones from Government quarries for *bona fide* house builders has been removed? If not yet removed, will the Government be pleased to state when orders will be passed in the matter?